

1 Robert A. Sacks (SBN 150146)
sacksr@sullcrom.com
2 Edward E. Johnson (SBN 241065)
johnsonee@sullcrom.com
3 SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP
1888 Century Park East, Suite 2100
4 Los Angeles, California 90067-1725
Tel.: (310) 712-6600
5 Fax: (310) 712-8800

6 *Attorneys for Non-Parties Metro-Goldwyn-*
Mayer Inc., Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios
7 *Inc., Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Pictures Inc. and*
United Artists Corporation
8

9
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
12

13 FOURTH AGE LTD., *et al*,
14 Plaintiffs,
15 v.
16 WARNER BROS. DIGITAL
17 DISTRIBUTION, *et al*,
18 Defendants.

19 WARNER BROS. DIGITAL
20 DISTRIBUTION INC., *et al*,
21 Counterclaim
Plaintiffs,
22 v.
23 FOURTH AGE LTD., *et al*,
24 Counterclaim
25 Defendants.
26
27
28

Case No. 12-9912-ABC (SHx)

**JOINDER BY MGM IN
WARNER'S AND ZAENTZ'S
MOTION TO DISQUALIFY
GREENBERG GLUSKER**

Judge: Hon. Audrey B. Collins
Magistrate: Hon. Stephen J. Hillman

Hearing Date: July 7, 2014
Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m.

Discovery Cut-Off: July 29, 2014

1 Non-Parties Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc., Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios
2 Inc. (f/k/a Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc.), Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Pictures Inc. and
3 United Artists Corporation (collectively, “MGM”) hereby join in Warner’s and
4 Zaentz’s Motion to Disqualify Greenberg Glusker (the “Motion”) filed on June 9,
5 2014, ECF Docket No. 188. As set forth in the Motion, although MGM is not a
6 party to this action, it has a financial interest in the outcome of the suit, and United
7 Artists Corporation, a subsidiary of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc., is the
8 holder of the privilege that has been invaded. *See* Mot. at 3.

9 MGM may properly join in the Motion to protect its attorney-client privilege.
10 *See Medical Diagnostic Imaging, PLLC v. CareCore Nat., LLC*, 542 F. Supp. 2d
11 296, 305 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (permitting nonparty to intervene for limited purpose of
12 seeking disqualification); *Oxford Systems, Inc. v. CellPro, Inc.*, 45 F. Supp. 2d
13 1055, 1058 (W.D. Wash. 1999) (permitting nonparty to intervene “for the sole
14 purpose of moving to disqualify” defense counsel); *Greene, Tweed of Delaware,*
15 *Inc. v. DuPont Dow Elastomers, L.L.C.*, 202 F.R.D. 426, 428 n.3 (E.D. Pa. 2001)
16 (permitting nonparty to intervene for “limited purpose” of protecting privileged
17 information); *Ledwig v. Cuprum S.A.*, 2004 WL 573650, at *1 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 28,
18 2004) (same); *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.*, 468 F. Supp. 2d 359, 360 (D.
19 Conn. 2007) (same); *see also In re Grand Jury Subpoena*, 274 F.3d 563, 570 (1st
20 Cir. 2001) (protecting privileged information is sufficient interest for limited
21 intervention).

22
23
24
25
26
27
28

